ERIC P. NEWMAN NUMISMATIC EDUCATION SOCIETY

6450 Cecil Avenue, St. Louis 5, Missouri

REGISTERED MAIL

August 21, 1974

Mr. Charles Hoskins
American Numismatic Association Certification Service
P. O. Box 87, Ben Franklin Station
Washington, D. C. 20044

Dear Charles:

In accordance with your telephone request, I am returning all of the items we have on hand, being the following:

Coin No.

7510 (1783) Libertas Americana Medal. Wt. 743 grains; specific gravity 8.98. The specific gravity tends to indicate it is silver plated over a worn copper original. It could however be a mixed metal cast as evidenced by the edge defect opposite the LI of LIBERTY. Whether it is a cast or an altered copper piece is not worth while testing. In either case it is not a silver original.

8213 U. S. Assay Office $50 slug, 887 fine, 50 D C with 50 incused in center of reverse, in casting metal. This is not a struck piece. It weighs 770 grains and has a specific gravity of 9.8. There is a raised casting bubble between R and I of AMERICA; above left upright of U; and outside scalloped ring at 11 o'clock. There is a rough surface on the eagle and the center of the obverse field. The reverse is weak, not worn. There are no edge ridges. It is cast, not struck. Forgery.

8457 Rosa Americana 1723 halfpence. Surface damage on obverse. Genuine.

8331 1804 U. S. Cent with counterstamp 2 on reverse. Reverse die break. Apparently used as an identification check. Genuine but abused.

8219 1798 not 1799 U. S. Cent. Genuine.

8452 1803 U. S. $5 in copper. Struck forgery made by Kettle with name removed. False.

8552 1783 Chalmers 6d. Milled edge, 30.6 grains. Genuine.

7752 1799 U.S.Cent. S 189. Genuine but in miserable condition.

8172 ROOK MINING CO. PLYMOUTH, VT. 1884 5 oz. .999 FINE. Cast rectangular flat gold bar, 3¼" x 1-1/16" x 1/8". Individually punched letters on one face only. O as a letter is same as O as a number. This is not a numismatic item and I know nothing about the company. I would reject it as a souvenir unless further proof is furnished.

We hope we have been of service.

Sincerely yours,

EPN;atb

ERIC P. NEWMAN

AMERICAN NUMISMATIC ASSOCIATION

CERTIFICATION SERVICE

CHARLES R. HOSKINS
Director
P.O. Box 87, Ben Franklin Station
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20044

August 23, 1974

Mr. Eric P. Newman
6450 Cecil Avenue
St. Louis, MO 63105

Ref: Coin # 8172

Dear Eric:

When I sent you the Rook Mining Co. gold bar I neglected to enclose material on the early history of the company which was provided by the submittor. You will find it enclosed.

Please return the enclosures when you have finished.

In scanning the documentation I noted no reference to the production of such bars.

I'm puzzled by the fact that the bar says "ROOK MINING CO." and the enclosures refer to "ROOKS", not "ROOK". A minor difference, but possibly significant.

Apparently there is a cash flow of up to $5,000.00 between several parties which is halted until they hear further from us, so they're interested in receiving a firm opinion as soon as practical.

Please feel free to call me collect (202:347-1695) to express your feelings about the enclosures.

I'm still dubious about the piece, but if it's genuine it would help to know.

Cordially,

Chuck

Charles Hoskins

ERIC P. NEWMAN NUMISMATIC EDUCATION SOCIETY

6450 Cecil Avenue, St. Louis 5, Missouri

August 29, 1974

Mr. Charles R. Hoskins
ANACS
P. O. Box 87
Ben Franklin Station
Washington, D. C. 20044

Dear Charles:

Supplementing our prior opinion as to Item 8172, by virtue of new data recently furnished by you, we are pleased to add the following:

You point out the true name is Rooks, not Rook. The fact that the S is omitted from ROOKS on the Vermont Bar should not give rise to an inference that the bar was made to rook somebody, but it appears to be a fatal error in our opinion.

An interesting comparable incident occurred with respect to the Colorado gold mining firm of John Parson(s) & Co. There are genuine $2.50 and $5.00 pieces (undated) which have only Parson & Co. on them, but the modern discovery of the 1860 $20.00 bar has Parsons & Co. on it. The $20.00 bar was first listed in the Red Book and then was delisted. If all $20.00 Parsons bars are false (and it is our opinion that they are), and the forger used an extra S in making them, perhaps he was trying to save his S on the Rook bar.

The documentary material submitted with respect to the Vermont bar mentions bars on page 23 and these were sizes made for shipment and, therefore, would be much larger than 5 ounces. There is no mention of small bars. The documentary material furnished is somewhat promotional, but that doesn't affect the problem at hand.

I believe that the source of the Vermont bar should be furnished. Who owned it in the past, what was paid for it if sold, when did these events occur, etc.? The provenance is often very helpful.

I am returning the documentary material.

Sincerely yours,

Eric P. Newman

EPN:jah

Encs.

Since 1928
A. M. Kagin
Don Kagin

A. M. and DON KAGIN, INC.
FORMERLY HOLLINBECK-KAGIN'S

Suite 400-412
Royal Union Bldg.
Des Moines, Iowa 50309
Telephone
(515) 243-0129

September 23, 1975

Mr. Eric P. Newman
6450 Cecil Ave.
St. Louis, Missouri 63105

Dear Eric:

Please forgive me for not contacting you sooner, but I wanted to get a few ideas and information put together so you could see where I was at in my Ph.D. program.

Enclosed is a statement of what I believe to be the standards for a Ph.D. candidate in Numismatics. By the time of my Terminar I believe I will have met these requirements.

Concerning my P.D. or reference book of Private Gold Issues, etc., after 2½ years I have compiled perhaps 90-95% of the necessary research for the book. I have a couple of sources sending me some additional material that I will incorporate at some point. The Bibliography enclosed is not complete but will give you a good idea of where I've been and what I've seen. Any suggestions will be appreciated.

I would like general or technical comments on my outline. It isn't a formal composition, but I will pretty much follow it unless someone takes strong objection to an entry.

I organized the outline after some thought and now feel it is the best approach to the subject.

I have found much new information, answered a number of questions, asked a few new ones, and have made more than a few speculations.

I have written a tentative introduction (enclosed) in order for you to get a look at the broad perspective of what I am writing about. The copy is more of a dramatic declaration than a scholarly article and will probably be modified somewhat in the final writing, but again, it was written with the intent of getting a novice interested in my subject.

I have also written some of the stories of the various mints (see part II) and am continuing to do so now.

My committee is composed of P.J. Manion, Colorado (core), B.J. Thompson, California, and Hal Vogel (peers), Pennsylvania, Henry Clifford, California, and Walter Breen, California (adjunct professors). At the urging of P.J., I am attempting to recruit a Ph.D. knowledgable in Numismatics. I have someone in mind and hope I can soon report favorably on his acceptance.

Consultants for my program are John Ford, Don Taxay, Art Kagin, Jack Klanson, Eric Newman, and Abe Kosoff.

Since 1928

A. M. Kagin

Don Kagin

A. M. and DON KAGIN, INC.

FORMERLY HOLLINBECK-KAGIN'S

Suite 400-412
Royal Union Bldg.
Des Moines, Iowa 50309
Telephone
(515) 243-0129

Now is the time to send me comments on the material I have sent you and anything else. There is, for example, the question of an internship. Since I have steadily worked on my book, traveling all over this country, etc., there is no absolute need for another type of program. However, some committee members have expressed the thought of "expanding my perspective." They suggest putting down my book and either study metallurgy (at the Franklin Mint), or travel to art institutes e.g. Boston Museum of Fine Arts, and study protraiture in coins.

One member suggested working on a pilot project in teaching teachers how to teach numismatics. I have done some work on this, but have not implemented a program yet, as I have been intent on finishing my book.

Please send me your comments soon as I am at a crucial juncture in my Ph.D. program and would like some direction.

Thank you very much.

Shalom,

Don

DK/bh

Enc.

ERIC P. NEWMAN NUMISMATIC EDUCATION SOCIETY

6450 Cecil Avenue, St. Louis 5, Missouri

October 2, 1975

Mr. Don Kagin
Suite 400
Royal Union Bldg.
Des Moines, Iowa 50309

Dear Don:

I have carefully read your interesting letter of September 23, 1975, about your Ph.D. program and the book on U. S. Private Gold which you are writing. We have gladly helped you on other topics in the past and you know our enthusiasm for numismatic scholarship .

We have determined that I should not be named as one of the consultants. There are just too many possible conflicts. Your family owns the Clifford collection which combines many former collections. Can you have an unbiased point of view? There are committee members and consultants you have named with whom our views would not be in harmony. It would not be right for me to be placed in a position where controversy might arise with you, or with any of them because of your dissertation. Your family did not cooperate with us when we wished to do research on a piece or so in the field you are writing about. You may, or may not, have access to the material in the Garland vs. Ryan arbitration and litigation as there seems to be no reference to it in your outline.

There will be other situations in the future where we can be mutually helpful and I am sure you will understand my point of view in this situation.

As to your outline of the requirements of a Professor of Numismatics, and for a Ph.D., I believe these are academic matters which a faculty would want to determine.

Sincerely yours,

Eric P. Newman

jah

Bowers and Ruddy Galleries, Inc.

6922 Hollywood Blvd., Suite 600
Los Angeles, California 90028

Telex: 69-1555 Photograde LSA
Telephone: (213) 466-4595

Managing Directors:
James F. Ruddy
Nancy Ruddy
Q. David Bowers

September 12, 1977

Mr. Eric P. Newman
6450 Cecil Ave
St. Louis 5, MO

Dear Eric:

Thank you for your letter of August 31st. Earlier I had discussed this matter with Douglas Weaver, the Executive Secretary of the PNG, and he advised me that the files concerning the situation were now in the possession of the Smithsonian Institution and were available, he believed, to any interested party. So, you might contact the Smithsonian Institution and check this out.

If this lead does not bear fruit, drop me a note and I will write to each one of the arbitrators concerning the matter.

Best wishes,

Q. David Bowers

CC: Douglas Weaver

Professional Numismatists Guild, Inc.

THIS CORRESPONDENCE FROM

the office of Executive Secretary, DOUGLAS W. WEAVER
208 Lake Air National Bank Bldg. • Waco, Texas 76710 • 817/ 776-6072

September 14, 1977

Mr. Eric P. Newman
6450 Cecil Avenue
St. Louis, Missouri 63105

Dear Mr. Newman:

Pursuant to our phone call this date I offer the following information to you regarding the Garland vs Ryan arbitration.

At the outset I would like to make the point that the PROFESSIONAL NUMISMATISTS GUILD has no function in these matters except to set up the arbitration and get the signatures of the principles involved agreeing to the arbitration. After we have accomplished this and accumulated any input the parties involved have to offer, we in turn furnish all the information we have to the arbitrators. All that is kept in our files are the agreements to arbitrate by the parties involved and the agreement to arbitrate by the arbitrators themselves.

Because of your previous request for the records of this case, I called Lester Merkin and agreed with him that it would be well if Herb Bergen, Ronnie Carr and the two of us could meet at the NASC Convention in Los Angeles to discuss the matter. I was interested in learning what I could about the matter so I would have first hand information. I wrote Bergen and Carr inviting them to meet with Lester and myself at the above mentioned time. Neither Bergen or Carr showed up to meet with us. I then had a lengthy conversation with Lester. He advised me that he had no objections to anyone seeing the files and would like to get rid of the files, but he and the other arbitrators had signed an agreement that they would never release the documents. Now as to who requested this, I do not know. I was not involved and there is nothing in any arbitration I have been involved in that stipulated this. I would only be guessing if I presumed to state who asked for this. Either of the arbitrators should be able to supply this information. The arbitrators are not beholding to PNG in any manner whatsoever in any of these things and we have no right to ask them to divulge or not divulge. If this is not the case, someone will have to straighten me out.

After talking to Lester I talked to John Ford and he advised me that the entire arbitration package was in the hands of the Smithsonian Institute in Washington, D.C. and they were available for anyone to see or make copies of. I do not know this for a fact, but only relay to you what I was told.

Hopefully, this clarifies this matter once and for all as far as PNG is concerned. I was under the impression that you were advised of the above facts and I am sorry you were not long ago.

If I can clarify any of the above points, I will be happy to do so.

Sincerely,

Douglas Weaver
Executive Secretary

DW/bd

cc: Q. David Bowers
File

ERIC P. NEWMAN NUMISMATIC EDUCATION SOCIETY

6450 Cecil Avenue, St. Louis 5, Missouri

October 14, 1977

Mr. Douglas E. Weaver
Professional Numismatists Guild, Inc.
208 Lake Air National Bank Bldg.
Waco, TX 76710

Dear Mr. Weaver:

I wanted to acknowledge and thank you for your letter of September 14, 1977, with respect to the Garland v. Kvan arbitration. We have written to Lester and Herb asking them about the agreement not to disclose. We have also pointed out that Kvan is being deprived of the information which has needed it and needs it in connection with inquiries concerning coins submitted.

We have not written to Smithsonian because our past communications from them have not been helpful to us. They removed certain information from their files after we had requested it and wrote us that they returned it to the party to whom the information belonged.

I look forward to receiving answers from Lester and Herb and thank you for your prompt cooperation in connection with this matter.

Sincerely,

Eric P. Newman

jah

ANACS-E-5759-B

1853 900 fine $20 U.S. Assay Office.
33.50 grams. (517.0 grains) Sp. gr. 17.8.

This piece was No. 6 in a group of about 20 similar pieces studied by us about 15 years ago. It is distinguished from all other known pieces by having in the obverse field equally spaced and close spiral tool marks on all except the left side. In our opinion this concentric appearing group of circular lines resulted from the use of an automatic cross cutting tool when a lathe was used to cut off the end of a steel rod being prepared as part of the forgery process. The steel rod was to be used as a false hub or false die to be made by a pressure transfer process. The tool marks in our opinion did not result from the preparation in a lathe of the gold planchet on which the coin was struck.

The submitted piece is one of the coins in a socalled "hoard" found in recent years and has been studied by many people. One piece from the hoard with a glittering surface was the subject of an arbitration under PNG auspices and litigation in Cook County, Illinois. The arbitration panel unanimously determined that the coin was not a proof and the court sustained the decision of the arbitrators. The arbitration panel was about to give an opinion on whether that coin was or was not genuine but did not file any opinion on that issue. Neither PNG nor members of the arbitration panel have been willing to make any of the official files available for review by appropriate persons and should be requested to do so by ANACS either under the Code of Ethics or otherwise. We have been denied the right to examine certain parts of these files after many requests. We have learned additional facts and have come to further conclusions subsequent to the original opinion given in that arbitration.

We have concluded that the original pair of dies for the 1853 $20 U. S. Assay Office 900 fine were improperly removed from and not returned to the U. S. Mint in Philadelphia sometime after 1912. These dies were not used by the person who took them. Transfer hubs and transfer dies were secretly and privately made at a much later date from the original dies. There was polishing and tooling on the hubs and on the dies and a few coins were struck in various stages of the completion of polishing and tooling of the dies. Others were struck after completion. There was a new collar prepared in a broaching machine with 170 reeds on the edge, the normal collar having 162 reeds. One of the false dies was cut into parts to produce other related gold and lead numismatic items. Although the Red Book has properly delisted related items there has been a general fear of and spinelessness toward bringing the facts into the open. This attitude is not limited to a few people but to several large numismatic organizations and many individuals. It could also have many economic reverberations if the facts were available.

The submitted piece has a ball shaped raised die break on top of the first A of ASSAY. This developed in the late stages of the use of the original die, but is not found on some of the other related pieces as it was ground off of the forged transfer hub. A similar raised oval die break between the top parts of SS in ASSAY also can be noticed on the submitted piece.

There is an identifying nick which appears on the obverse as a line dent rising to the right on the upper part of the I in UNITED. This nick is

not an accident to the coin but is in the false die. Similarly there is a diagonal nick in the lower text panel line of the reverse below the right side of the F in CALIFORNIA. This is also a characteristic of the false die and not an accident to the coin.

The normal die break lump on the right side of the T in UNITED on the reverse is present along with the breaks connecting the L of GOLD with letters above and below.

The surface of the submitted piece is mildly shiny but much duller than the pieces with a glittering surface.

This submitted piece is the most important link in a modern forgery saga in our opinion and should be retained by ANACS, if at all possible for instruction purposes. In our opinion it is a most dangerous forgery and as such an outstanding example of the efforts which have been taken to deceive numismatists.

Much additional data and research are available from us if the matter is to be further studied.

Eric P. Newman

for

October 24, 1978 ERIC P. NEWMAN NUMISMATIC EDUCATION SOCIETY

HERBERT M. BERGEN
PETROLEUM ENGINEER
(REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER P819)
604 NORTH HARBOR BLVD.
FULLERTON, CALIFORNIA

November 1st
1977

Mr. Eric P. Newman
6450 Cecil Ave.
St Louis, Mo. 63105

Dear Eric:

Please excuse my delay in answering your letter of October 14th, addressed to Lester Merkin and myself. I was out of town when it arrived and then decided to try and locate Ronnie Carr, the third member of the Garland vs Ryan Arbitration Panel, before answering, in order to have his views about the matter. Also, I thought that I would stay while hear from Lester Merkin, but no word from him. So far I have not been able to find any trace of Ronnie Carr. It will take the concept of all three panel members to release the panel files because we had a verbal agreement covering such an action. No written agreement that would confirm the verbal agreement was made.

What John Ford states to the effect that the entire arbitration passage is in the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, D. C. cannot be true because I was chairman of the panel and so had custody of the files. I recall placing them in storage with other files when I closed my office several years ago.

The only information or statement that was given out by the panel when it concluded its arbitration proceedings was its decision that the subject coin, a 1953 (20 U. S. Assay Office gold coin, was not a proof coin as represented to Garland when it was sold to him. The seller of the coin admitted in the hearing before the panel that such a representation was made to Garland. The panel gave no other opinion as to whether the subject coin was genuine or a fake. It was on the evidence and the decision of the panel that the subject coin was not a proof that Garland was able to get his purchase money back.

The panel was under no obligation to surrender its files to PNC which was instrumental in getting the arbitration set up. The only contact that I had with PNC after the panel decision was rendered and the subject coin returned to it was my request to be reimbursed for the out-of-pocket expenses that were incurred in making various tests of the subject coin to determine if it was genuine and a proof. I recall that Douglas Weaver asked that I meet with him in Los Angeles at the NASC show. I was unable to attend this show until late on the last day when I was told he had left the show. I did not follow up on this because I could not locate Ronnie Carr. Merkin had also left for home.

HERBERT M. BERGEN
PETROLEUM ENGINEER
(REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER P819)
604 NORTH HARBOR BLVD.
FULLERTON, CALIFORNIA

Dale P. Bowman 11/2/77
page 2

I sincerely regret I cannot comply with your request to release the arbitration files. I know you would a lot to assist the panel with its investigation and no one deserves more than you what is in the panel files. However, I have always made it a rule to keep any agreement that I made. Therefore, until I can get the consent of the other two panel members, I dont see how I can help you.

I will try my best to find Dennie Carr. Later this month I plan to be in New York and will try to get together with Lester Merkin. Am sending him a copy of this letter. A copy of same is also being sent to Doug Wearen.

Due to the death of Mrs. Bergen I could not arrange to attend the ANA convention in Atlanta. I hope to be at the next convention in Texas next year, provided the ANA does not fall apart under the inept leadership of Grover Criswell. In protest to his behaviour I have removed my Colonial collection that I have had on exhibit during the Bicentenial in the ANA Museum in Colorado Springs. I am keeping my San Francisco Mint collection on exhibit at the old Mint in San Francisco, out of respect to Mary Brooks who did so much to save the old Mint as a museum.

With my best personal regards and the hope that I meet with you soon somewhere in the interests of numismatics.

Herbert M. Bergen

ERIC P. NEWMAN NUMISMATIC EDUCATION SOCIETY

6450 Cecil Avenue, St. Louis 5, Missouri

November 10, 1977

Mr. Herbert M. Bergen
604 North Harbor Blvd.
Fullerton, CA 92631

Dear Herb:

I appreciate very much your letter of November 1, 1977. You were nice enough to go into full detail and I fully understand your position.

I hope that you will be able to locate Ronnie Carr and to obtain a response from Lester Merkin. I have not heard from Lester as yet.

I have kept items on exhibit in the San Francisco Mint just as you have, but I have continued to cooperate with the ANA because I believe in the institution regardless of the actions of its Board of Directors and officers. As you well know, I have stayed far away from ANA politics because I had feelings like you have long, long ago.

I am still hopeful of obtaining the files and I am satisfied that you will find a way to make them available.

My kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

Eric P. Newman

jah

Bowers and Ruddy Galleries, Inc.

6922 Hollywood Blvd., Suite 600
Los Angeles, California 90028

Telex: 69-1555 Photograde LSA
Telephone: (213) 466-4595

Managing Directors:
James F. Ruddy
Nancy Ruddy
Q. David Bowers

September 12, 1977

Mr. Eric P. Newman
6450 Cecil Ave
St. Louis 5, MO

Dear Eric:

Thank you for your letter of August 31st. Earlier I had discussed this matter with Douglas Weaver, the Executive Secretary of the PNG, and he advised me that the files concerning the situation were now in the possession of the Smithsonian Institution and were available, he believed, to any interested party. So, you might contact the Smithsonian Institution and check this out.

If this lead does not bear fruit, drop me a note and I will write to each one of the arbitrators concerning the matter.

Best wishes,

Q. David Bowers

CC: Douglas Weaver

WESTERN PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC.

September 26, 1978

Mr. Eric P. Newman
6450 Cecil Avenue
St. Louis, Missouri 63105

Dear Eric:

As you probably know, Donald Kagin has now finished writing his book on PRIVATE AND TERRITORIAL GOLD COINS. He has asked me to publish the work, and I would like your advice or opinion about the quality of his research.

Don realizes that there would be no money in printing and distributing his book but has agreed to pay for the printing costs just to get the book published. It is a vanity situation that would have some obvious economic advantages for Kagins and their enormous stock of gold coins.

Apparently he is willing to go along with paying the expenses just to have the Whitman name on the book and use our editorial services and distribution system. Even so, I could probably not make any money on such a book. On the other hand, it would do no harm providing it turned out to be an attractive and respectable numismatic work.

In reading through the manuscript I find that he has done a good job of researching the various companies and listing the known varieties. What bothers me most is his inclusion of questionable items like the following: James King ingot, Blake & Agnell, Blake & Co., Diana Gambling House token, H. M. Naglee and Company 1850 $100 ingot, Wells Fargo and Company 1854 $323 ingot, Adams and Company ingots, Brasher "Lima" Doubloon and Brasher Half Doubloon.

I hope that perhaps you have had an opportunity to see the manuscript or discuss some of this with Kagin and can give me an insight into the quality of his work and advisability of our publishing it. I do not mean to put you on the spot, but hope that you will just speak freely and I can take it from there. Personally, I find the book rather enjoyable and think that it would be worthwhile.

1220 Mound Avenue/Racine, Wisconsin 53404/Telephone (414) 633-2431

On a couple of completely different subjects ...

Bert and I are looking forward to the ANA Convention in St. Louis and I want to reserve my room early to be sure to get a choice spot. I understand conventioneers will be housed in two different hotels. Can you tell me which would be the best or most practical for attending meetings, etc. If necessary, I will make reservations at both and cancel one out later when headquarters lets us know what is happening.

At a recent local show I purchased an extraordinary Oak Tree Shilling. It is a fine example of Noe 10 and seems to be as nice as any of the half dozen or so other specimens that I have been able to trace.

As you know, I do not particularly collect rare varieties so if this is anything that you can use, you are welcome to it. I do not especially want to sell it outright but would be happy to trade it for a more common Pine or Oak Tree piece in nice condition.

Sincerely,

WESTERN PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC.

Kenneth E. Bressett, Manager
Whitman Coin Products

KEB:jt

ERIC P. NEWMAN NUMISMATIC EDUCATION SOCIETY

6450 Cecil Avenue, St. Louis 5, Missouri

September 29, 1978

Mr. Kenneth Bressett
Whitman Publishing Co.
1220 Mound Avenue
Racine, WI 53404

Dear Ken:

I have not seen the Don Kagin book on private and territorial gold, but I am told it is the thesis on which he received a Ph.D. degree. Since you have been asked to publish it that makes a difficult business decision of yours.

I am not surprised that Don is willing to pay all the expense of publication to have the Whitman name on the book. If you can't make any money on the book even on that basis then Evelyn as a stockholder of Western Publishing Company will raise her eyebrows if you undertake the matter.

When Don wrote me about the advisory committees on the book, I declined to serve. He sent me an outline of the book and I wrote him a letter telling him he ought to include the Garland vs. Fyan dispute and F.N.C. arbitration and the subsequent litigation in Cook County, Illinois. Did he include it? If so, what did he say?

As far as the Lima doubloon, Blake & Agnell and other pieces are concerned, I believe you have a conflict. They are not in your Red Book and yet you would be publishing them elsewhere as bona fide. Do you expect to add all these items to the Red Book?

You state that the publication would have some obvious economic advantages for the Kagin's inventory of gold coins. If, therefore, a vocal person or group have doubts as to the status of the pieces, then you might be subject to strong criticism about your selling your company's and your personal soul and doing great harm to numismatics. Everyone will think that your company is making money on the book regardless what you say.

You have an interesting problem.

Sincerely,

Eric P. Newman

jah

ERIC P. NEWMAN NUMISMATIC EDUCATION SOCIETY

6450 Cecil Avenue, St. Louis, Missouri 63105

June 6, 1979

Mr. Clement Bailey
Numismatic News
Coin Clinic
Iola, WI 54945

Dear Mr. Bailey:

On page 24 of Numismatic News of June 9, 1979, your column states that there are two genuine pieces of the Blake & Company $20 1855 gold piece. This is a very controversial matter. You will note that the Red Book does not list the coin at all. You must realize that this coin and a group of other unknown pieces appeared about 20 years ago and that there is a substantial difference of opinion with respect to the matter.

Sincerely,

Eric P. Newman

jah

Clement F. Bailey

Free - lance Writer

Box 275 Iola, Wisconsin 54945

June 27, 1979

Eric:

I am not on the staff of Numismatic News or Krause Publications, for that matter as I am one of the very few free-lancers in numismatics.

My Q & A columns, which appear in five different publications are done on contract. This includes answers to any questions written to the publication by readers of the columns. The mail runs about 7,500 letters per year.

As for the Blake issue. We have used various answers in the past fifteen years we have done such columns. If we mention that they are souvenirs we hear from Don Taxay - as he lists two in his book. If we mention that a couple exist then we hear from other sources.

A Q & A column is never quite right and never quite wrong, it can be good or bad but one thing for sure it is always controversial.

Most of the current Blake issues were given away by the Dodge Gold Duster campaign. When writers mention the Blake piece in some article then we hear from all of the holders of the brass pieces.

Glad to have received your note!

23 March 1982

Mr. Eric P. Newman
6450 Cecil Ave.
St. Louis, Missouri 63105
U S A

Dear Eric,

I've waited to reply to your kind note of last November, on the Tubac article, until I had the offprints in hand. They have only recently arrived, and I'll enclose two with this letter. There seem to be a great many, more than I can possibly dispose of, so if you want more just let me know.

This is the end of the road for me on this matter. With the Mexican bars, and now the Tubac ingot, I've covered all the fakes of this sort known to me, and I don't have any expertise in the US material. You do, and I have to say, without I hope hurting any feelings, that it has been a considerable disappointment to me that you have supported and encouraged me to do my publishing while you haven't done any yourself (as far as I'm aware). You talked to me at length about the US fakes as long ago as the New York Congress -- 9 years -- and you obviously could say all kinds of things about their technique which would warn collectors. But I do have the feeling that you've let me carry the can, which I have done willingly enough, hoping that you would do the same in your field.

One result of this situation is that the Mexican bars have pretty well disappeared from the market -- they show up now at great intervals, certainly not in the quantities which appeared before I wrote. But the US junk goes from strength to strength, when you could have been doing something about it. I haven't seen Clifford's book, and my fears about it are perhaps unjustified. But Kagin's ridiculous dissertation is now a book, I see it in libraries, and referred to in Bowers & Ruddy's ads as authoritative. It permanitizes some of the fake western bars.

So where have you been when we needed you? Everyone knows your opinions -- you've made no attempt to hide them, I think. But you could have put them down in print where they would take, with the arguments which would persuade and would be permanently available. You would find, as I have, that if it were difficult or undesirable to publish in the States, outlets are available elsewhere. It is still not too late, it will I suppose never be too late until you are beyond the capacity; but meanwhile our historical material is being corrupted by unscrupulous men. How about helping out? I do think I've done my share.

Best,

Tom

Re: U.S. Territorial Gold Items;
letter to Buttrey

BE very impressed. Very thorough. However, still think one element missing. Seems no matter how painstakingly presented the record of the past may be, it still constitutes unwillingness to do anything further. If you can find some element that could be offered in view of your urging, possibly that you are willing to do. Perhaps you would be willing to write ANA based on ANACS matter, asking them to take it to their ethics committee or some other action. The fact that the Numismatic Press has been unwilling to tackle it does not need to conclude the matter. It seems to me that some events which involve the Smithsonian not only in knowingly acquiring some forgeries, covering up all of that might be a matter for general discussion. This and the Smithsonian cover-up, etc., might make a very interesting investigative reporting story for Washington Post or equivalent. Would be very interesting publication.

JAH

ERIC P. NEWMAN NUMISMATIC EDUCATION SOCIETY

6450 Cecil Avenue, St. Louis, Missouri 63105

April 26, 1982

Prof. T. V. Buttrey
6 De Freville Ave.
Cambridge, England CB4 1HR

Dear Ted:

Thank you for the offprints of your Tubac publication. You are to be congratulated again not only for the quality of research you long since did, but for your endless perseverance to have it published after years of frustration. At your convenience I would like a few more offprints.

I ordered and received two volumes of the Numismatic Chronicle containing your classic. I sent Margo Russell a copy of your opus but have seen nothing in Coin World mentioning it. I called Kenneth Bressett's attention to it. Peter Gaspar and I discussed it.

When I look back through the immense file I have on the subject of Mexican Bars and the Tubac matter I find I even raised "freedom of the press" as an issue in the failure to publish in United States some scholarly articles.

I understand the comment in your letter of 23 March 1982 that this is the end of the road for you on such forgery matters. As to your criticism of our or my actions (or inactions) as to U. S. territorial gold matters, I am writing you a separate letter. At least you concede that I encouraged and supported you. We both have been battling for integrity in numismatics for so long that I certainly respect and understand your stating your sincere opinion whether about me or otherwise.

Sincerely,

Eric P. Newman

jah

ERIC P. NEWMAN NUMISMATIC EDUCATION SOCIETY

6450 Cecil Avenue, St. Louis, Missouri 63105

April 29, 1982

Prof. Theodore V. Buttrey
6 De Freville Avenue
Cambridge, England CB4 1HR

Dear Ted:

Your letter of March 23, 1982, commenting upon our research as to some U. S. Territorial Gold items needs a somewhat detailed reply. I am glad to outline certain facts which I believe will be of help in your further understanding of past events. This letter is for you and not for publication, reproduction or circulation, but may be shared with other bonafide research scholars so long as they maintain identical restrictions.

There was a controversy in 1966 between Paul Garland as purchaser, and Tom Ryan as seller, concerning an 1853 $20 U.S. Assay office coin with Garland claiming a refund because the coin was false. The Professional Numismatists Guild, because Ryan was a member, set up an arbitration under its rules. The arbitrators were Herbert M. Bergen, Lester Merkin and Ronnie Carr. We testified on request and rendered written opinions and data along with others. The arbitrators unanimously ruled that the piece was not a proof and ordered a refund. No decision as to its falsity was rendered although each arbitrator's file contains such matters. The arbitrators determined not to disclose any data unless all three agreed. The defendant refused to pay back the money and suit was filed in the Circuit Court of Cook County, Illinois, and judgment rendered in favor of plaintiff. Then the money was refunded. Coin World mentioned the suit but no other numismatic or other press coverage resulted, although many were advised of it.

We have asked for the disclosure of the arbitrators' file on many occasions. When David Q. Bowers was president of P.N.G. we wrote him on August 31, 1977 to release the file. He replied on September 12, 1977 that he believed that the file was in the possession of Smithsonian Institution and was available to anyone interested. Douglas Weaver, executive secretary of P.N.G. in a letter dated 9/14/77 wrote to me pursuant to my request that he had telephoned John Ford who advised Weaver that the arbitration file was in the hands of Smithsonian and that P.N.G. had no right to ask the arbitrators to divulge their file. Whether Smithsonian has part or all of the file, I do not know. The Smithsonian possession of the file was denied by Herbert Bergen by letter dated November 1, 1977, when we requested the file from him and he turned down the request after Lester Merkin did not respond to his request to do so and he could not locate Ronnie Carr. We have requested Lester Merkin recently to disclose his file and I believe he would like to find a way to do so. One of the then motives to have the file available was to put it in the hands of ANACS, but that is somewhat solved because one of the 1853 $20 U.S. Assay Office pieces was submitted to ANACS in 1978. On October 24, 1978 we gave an opinion to ANACS that the submitted coin was a forgery, but we do not know what opinion ANACS gave the submitter. A copy of the opinion is enclosed so you see that the American Numismatic Association through its ANACS division has long since had our opinion.

There is naturally a doubt in our mind as to whether we have the right to publish opinions rendered to the PNG panel or to ANACS when they requested such opinions under conditions of confidentiality. ANACS publishes in The Numismatist selected forgery matters and publishes separate forgery bulletins. If others can bring about disclosure of additional opinions by ANACS, that might be of interest to readers.

A few other events may be of interest in connection with our actions on this matter.

When special legislation was pending before Congress on the Josiah Lilly sale of coins to Smithsonian I was asked to testify as to some gold pieces before the U. S. House of Representatives Judicial Committee. The night before the hearing in Washington, D. C. I received a telegram in St. Louis that the hearing was cancelled and the legislation was passed thereafter without any request for my further participation. When Smithsonian was subsequently asked by us to furnish a copy of the original detailed inventory of the Lilly collection under the Freedom of Information Act the U. S. Government turned down the request on the ground that the item belonged to the Lilly Estate and not to the United States. When this was pointed out to be no basis for failure to furnish the item, Smithsonian admitted expunging the item from its file by returning the item to the Lilly Estate so that Smithsonian did not have the item any more. There are copies of this material elsewhere, but we still need one page to complete our file.

On September 25, 1975, Don Kagin wrote me requesting comments on his outline for the book he was writing on U. S. Private Gold for his Ph.D and requesting me to be a consultant for his program. By letter dated October 2, 1975, I turned down the consultancy partly because of a possible conflict because his family owned the Clifford collection. I also pointed out that the Garland vs. Ryan controversy was not mentioned in his outline. The Garland vs. Ryan matter was not mentioned in Don Kagin's book when finally published. Kenneth E. Bressett on September 26, 1978 was working for Western Publishing Company when he wrote me that it was asked to publish the Kagin book and he wished our comment on the quality of research. On September 29, 1978, we replied that we had not seen the manuscript and wondered if the Garland vs. Ryan matter was included. We pointed out that the Red Book which he edited might be in conflict with the Kagin book on certain matters. The Kagin book was not published until after Bressett had taken a position with Kagin's firm. Thus, Bressett is in a most complex position to make further comment on the matter. I understand that he had no participation in the editing or publication of the Kagin book.

As to the Clifford Collection Sale on March 18-20, 1982, by Bowers & Ruddy, there are extensive quotations from material written by John Ford inserted in the catalog prior to Lot #26. An advertisement of the sale on February 24, 1982, in Coin World indicates that the catalog was written by Clifford and members of Bowers' firm. In the March 10, 1982 advertisement and news article John Ford is added as participant in writing the catalog. A substantial quotation is from material filed by John Ford on behalf of Ryan in the Garland vs. Ryan arbitration. Ryan lost the arbitration as previously stated. It, therefore, seems questionable to use self selected matters submitted by the losing side as probative. It also shows how important it is for the arbitrators to release their complete file.

Our research has only covered the 1853 $20 U.S. Assay Office pieces. That research is in ANA (ANACS) hands. We have never been asked to examine certain related pieces and have only seen them illustrated and some in museum cases. You indicate others also know our opinions. We believe we have done more than our part but are perfectly willing to continue the research or disclose facts. We are not looking for controversy but for scholarship. A few well placed polygraph tests would possibly clear up so much.

We thank you for giving us the opportunity to reply to your thoughts. You already know some of what I have outlined. Would that other scholarly oriented people were not involved financially in transactions, ownership and opinions on this matter or in fear of suits. If clarification or expansion of this letter is desired it can be done. If you have any ideas how to get American publication of these matters it would be welcomed.

My kindest wishes and regards.

Sincerely,

Eric P. Newman

jah